

JEANE HAMILTON (CSBN 157834)
ALBERT B. SAMBAT (CSBN 236472)
DAVID J. WARD (CSBN 239504)
CHRISTINA M. WHEELER (CSBN 203395)
MANISH KUMAR (CSBN 269493)
U.S. Department of Justice
Antitrust Division
450 Golden Gate Avenue
Box 36046, Room 10-0101
San Francisco, CA 94102
david.ward@usdoj.gov
Telephone: (415) 436-6660

Attorneys for the United States

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) Criminal No. CR 11-00796 CRB (JS)
)
) STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED)
) ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER
v.) THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT FROM
) NOVEMBER 29, 2011 TO JANUARY
) 18, 2012
PATRICK CAMPION,)
Defendant.)
)
)

On November 29, 2011, the parties in this matter appeared before the Honorable Magistrate Judge Joseph C. Spero for an initial appearance and arraignment. During this appearance, the parties stipulated that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from November 29, 2011 until January 18, 2012 for effective preparation of counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance was for the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B)(iv).

//

1 The parties also agree that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance
2 outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C.
3 § 3161(h)(7)(A).

4 SO STIPULATED:

5 _____/s/_____
6 Julia Mezinsky Jayne
7 Campbell & Jayne LLP
8 Counsel for Defendant Patrick Campion

_____/s/_____
David J. Ward
Jeane Hamilton
Albert B. Sambat
Christina M. Wheeler
Manish Kumar
Trial Attorneys
United States Department of Justice
Antitrust Division

11
12 As the Court found on November 29, 2011, and for the reasons stated above, the Court
13 finds that an exclusion of time from November 29, 2011 to January 18, 2012, is warranted and
14 that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and
15 the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161 (h)(7)(A). The failure to grant the
16 requested continuance would deny the defendant and deny defense counsel the reasonable time
17 necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would
18 result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
19
20

21
22 SO ORDERED.

23
24
25
26 DATED: 12/9/11 _____

27
28

JOSEPH C. SPERO
United States Magistrate Judge